

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 1:06-cr-197-MEF
)	(WO)
RODERICK CHARLES MELVIN)	

ORDER

On November 20, 2006, the government filed an Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial (Doc. #20). While the granting of a continuance is left to the sound discretion of the trial judge, *United States v. Warren*, 772 F.2d 827, 837 (11th Cir. 1985), the court is, of course, limited by the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The Speedy Trial Act provides generally that the trial of a defendant in a criminal case shall commence within 70 days of the latter of the filing date of the indictment or the date the defendant appeared before a judicial officer in such matter. 18 U.S.C. §3161(c)(1). *See United States v. Vasser*, 916 F.2d 624 (11th Cir. 1990).

The Act excludes from this 70 day period any continuance that the judge grants "on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial." 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

The motion states that the Recommendation of the Magistrate relating to the defendant's motion to suppress was filed on November 14, 2006. The government has requested an extension of time in order to acquire a transcript of the evidentiary hearing before filing an objection to the Recommendation. In addition, defense counsel is filing a

motion to withdraw as counsel for the defendant because of a conflict. The government requests a continuance of the trial to allow for an extension of time in which to file its objection to the Recommendation and for the defendant to be appointed new counsel. Consequently, the court concludes that a continuance of this case is warranted and that the ends of justice served by continuing this case outweighs the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See United States v. Davenport*, 935 F.2d 1223, 1235 (11th Cir. 1991)(reasonable time necessary for effective preparation is a significant factor for granting a continuance under the Speedy Trial Act).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

1. That the defendant's motion filed on November 20, 2006 is GRANTED;
2. That the trial of this defendant is continued from the November 27, 2006 trial term to the March 12, 2007 trial term.
3. That the Magistrate Judge conduct a pretrial conference prior to the March 12, 2007 trial term.

DONE this the 21st day of November, 2006.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE